





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/489,356 | 01/21/2000 | Hong Shih | AM-1622.D1 | AM-1622.D1 5730 | |
| 32588 | 7590 01/06/2003 | | | | |
| APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050 | | | ZERVIGO | ZERVIGON, RUDY | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1763 | 1/- | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 01/06/2003 | /0 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application N . | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/489,356 | SHIH ET AL. | | | |
| Advisory Addion | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Rudy Zervigon | 1763 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) 2,3,8-12,17 and 28-31 would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | o issues which were newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>17 and 29-31</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,8-16,18-23,28,32 and 33. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | |
| 8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp | roved by the Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | | |
| 10.□ Other: | | | | | |
| | | JEFFRIE R. LUND PRIMARY EXAMINER | | | |
| | | 1 | | | |

mx-16

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Claim 1 restricts the original surface roughness from 2.5micron or greater to a range between 2.5micron and 7.6micron which is adjacent to the Quartarone range of between 10.161micron and 17.78micron. Further consideration on whether it would be obvious for Quartarone to further machine his substrate to within the claimed range would have to be considered. Claim 13 and its dependents may still be rejected under the present obviousness type rejection of Quartarone in view of J.Linke et al as provided in the final rejection. In particular it would have to be considered whether it would be obvious for Quartarone to coat an unanodized portion of the substrate.